DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 242 IR 051 005

AUTHOR Brockman, J. R.
TITLE The Assessment of Library Performance. An Australian Perspective of the British Inter-Library Comparison Project.
INSTITUTION Western Australian Inst. of Tech., Perth.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-908155-68-9
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 26p.
AVAILABLE FROM Western Australian Institute of Technology, Kent Street, Bentley W.A. 6102, Australia ($2.00 per copy plus postage).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Comparative Analysis; *Cost Effectiveness; Efficiency; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Library Administration; Library Personnel; Library Research; *Organizational Effectiveness; Performance; Resource Allocation
IDENTIFIERS Australia; *British Library (England)

ABSTRACT

Based on material obtained and observations made in 1982, this Australian study focuses on the British Library's inter-library comparison (ILC) project for academic libraries. The report is presented in five sections, the first of which is a brief introduction. The second section deals with the general concept of inter-organization comparison as a management tool, particularly in the field of higher education. The third section describes the Centre for Interfirm Comparison (CIFC), the British Library's contractor for the academic libraries project. The fourth discusses the Centre's approach to ILC and includes a summary of those portions of the CIFC report that appear relevant to the decision on whether or not the technique would be appropriate for introduction to Australia. Finally, the fifth and last section contains an account of observations made during visits to 6 of the 20 participating libraries, together with points arising from meetings with the staff members of the British Library and the CIFC who were primarily responsible for the project. A nine-item reference list and two functional cost analysis tables--one for loans and reservations and the other for acquisitions and cataloging--from the Inter-Library Comparison for Academic Libraries are included. (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE ASSESSMENT OF LIBRARY PERFORMANCE

An Australian Perspective of the British Inter-Library Comparison Project

J.R. Brockman

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.R. Brockman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE ASSESSMENT OF LIBRARY PERFORMANCE

An Australian Perspective of the British Inter-library comparison project

J.R. Brockman

The Library
Western Australian Institute of Technology
Perth 1984

Western Australian Institute of Technology
Cataloguing in Publication Data :

Brockman, J.R.

The assessment of library performance :
an Australian perspective of the British inter-library comparison project

1. Libraries, University and college #2 Great Britain
2. Library administration #2 Great Britain #x Research

027.741

ISBN : 0 908155 68 9

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
A conceptual basis for inter-library comparison among institutions of higher education	3
The centre for Interfirm Comparison	5
Inter-library comparison	7
Observations on the university and polytechnic ILC project	12
References	17
Appendix Sample pages from CIFC report	18

INTRODUCTION

This paper is based on material obtained and observations made in 1982 while I was attached to the School of Library, Archive and Information Studies at University College London during a period of study leave.

The objectives of the study leave programme were twofold, the first being to investigate the application of certain econometric techniques to forecasting and planning for academic libraries. The second, which forms the subject of this report, was to study the British Library's inter-library comparison (ILC) project for academic libraries, which was then in progress. These two components were related, however, to the extent that both involved the application of quantitative techniques to library management using aggregated data. The first, which was essentially an approach at the sectoral level, was seen as a means of aiding the interpretation of the results of the second, which concentrated on the individual institution. These factors aside, the potential significance of the ILC project to Australian academic libraries was endorsed by many of the responses arising from a brief survey of the uses to which Australian college librarians were putting the annual statistical supplement to *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* (Brockman 1982). Replies contained ample evidence of the need in Australia for the kind of comparative information provided by the British ILC project.

The present report is in five main sections. The section following this introduction deals briefly with the general concept of inter-organisation comparison as a management tool, particularly in the field of higher education. The third section describes the Centre for Interfirm Comparison (CIFC), the British Library's contractor for the academic libraries project. The fourth discusses the Centre's approach to ILC and includes a summary of those portions of the CIFC report which appear particularly relevant to the decision on whether or not the technique would be appropriate for introduction to Australia. The report, of which I was kindly provided with an advance copy, was due to be published during 1983, but the working documents, comprising the reporting form and definitions developed for this comparison, remain the property of the CIFC and therefore will neither be reproduced nor made generally available. The fifth and final section of the paper contains an account of observations made during visits to six of the twenty participating libraries, together with points arising from meetings with those staff members of the British Library and Centre for Interfirm Comparison who were primarily responsible for the project.

I wish to acknowledge the help and assistance given by Mr Mike Moffatt, Senior Project Manager of the Centre for Interfirm Comparison, and Miss Maureen Grieves of the British Library Research and Development Department, who served as Project Officer for the study. I thank the librarians of St Andrews University, the University

of Edinburgh, the London School of Economics, the Imperial College of Science and Technology, London, the Polytechnic of Central London and the Polytechnic of North London, for allowing me to question them about their involvement in the project. I must also thank the librarians of the remaining fourteen institutions participating in the ILC project for expressing their willingness to see me. My original intention was to visit three or four more of the participating libraries but unfortunately the prolonged rail strike during June forced the curtailment of my itinerary. I express my gratitude to Professor B.C. Vickery of University College London for his hospitality and his kindness in conferring upon me an Honorary Research Fellowship, which greatly facilitated the econometric component of my study leave programme. Finally, I wish to acknowledge the receipt of a British Council Academic Links and Interchange Scheme Award.

A CONCEPTUAL BASIS FOR INTER-LIBRARY COMPARISON AMONG INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In the United Kingdom, Australia and elsewhere academic institutions, like many other non-profit making bodies, are increasingly being asked to justify to external funding bodies their performance in terms of their effectiveness and efficiency. Furthermore, within institutions, consideration must be given to the efficiency of the various administrative decisions made on resource allocation, many of which have already resulted in major cutbacks and internal reallocations. Managements, however, need a sound basis upon which to arrive at and justify such decisions. In particular, they need to develop and employ appropriate methods for allocating resources and subsequently assessing the component parts of their institutions.

Resource allocation, assessment of performance and comparisons - internal and external - are fraught with many fundamental problems and this area is the subject of an extensive literature. Such processes involve assumptions on the objectives - primary and secondary, long-term and short-term - of both the institution as a whole and its components down to the level of individual employees. In no kind of institution can the congruence of these goals be achieved. In institutions of education, however, the relativity between inputs and outputs is obscure and measurement of performance is problematical. Doubtless, it is for these reasons that such bodies appear to be distinguished more for the conflict than the unanimity of their goals.

While it may not be possible to agree objectives, measure outcomes and develop performance indicators for an institution as a whole, it may be possible to do so for some of its component parts. Thus performance indicators that relate physical and monetary inputs to outputs and outcomes may be developed and built into a planning and reporting system. Sorenson and Grove (1977) have summarized the objectives and properties of various service performance indicators as availability, awareness, accessibility, extensiveness, appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness, outcomes/benefits/impacts and acceptability. Many of these indicators are appropriate to the libraries and other central services of institutions of higher education.

Assuming such performance indicators can be developed for an academic library and that the underlying assumptions are recognised, the library management would be able to:

1) internally monitor trends in library performance indicators;
2) compare actual performance with planned performance in order to guide future decision-making; and
3) compare the library's performance with that of other libraries.

In view of the increasing external interest in inter-institutional comparisons of efficiency and effectiveness it is important to recognise the prerequisites for a system of comparison and what such comparisons

can and cannot reveal.

Sizer (1979) has identified the prerequisites for accurate and meaningful comparisons as :

1) establishing and agreeing with participating institutions a detailed data element dictionary;
2) designing and agreeing with participating institutions a methodology for collecting the data;
3) collecting and checking the actual data; calculating, tabulating and circulating input and output measures and performance indicators to participating institutions;
4) assisting the management of the participating institutions to interpret their data; and
5) undertaking a continuous programme of education in the use of inter-institutional comparisons.

In addition, and specifically in the context of small colleges in the United States, Weinburg (1977) has urged administrators to seek answers to the following questions :

1) Are our cost figures outside the range of other colleges?
2) Where is our college located on the cost curve?
3) What particular factors or elements appear outside the cost range?
4) What can we do to relieve the situation?

Since the publication of Sizer's criteria the Centre for Interfirm Comparison has made a very significant contribution to the field of academic inter-institutional comparison by embarking on the study of university and polytechnic libraries, under contract to the British Library. This investigation probably represents one of the most sophisticated and detailed comparisons yet made of any specific aspect of higher education. As suggested in the introduction to this report, there might be interest in the adaptation of the CIFC's academic library study for use in Australia, possibly extending the investigation to public libraries, the sector in which the British ILC work actually began.

THE CENTRE FOR INTERFIRM COMPARISON

The CIFC is a non-profit organisation established in 1959 by the British Institute of Management, in association with the British Productivity Council, specifically to meet the demand for a neutral, expert body to conduct interfirm comparisons, on a confidential basis, as a service to management. Since its foundation, the Centre has designed and conducted comparisons in over one hundred industries, trades, services and professions, in the private and public sectors, both in the United Kingdom and elsewhere. It is internationally recognised as a leading organisation in this field and has helped to establish interfirm comparison (IFC) organisations in a number of countries, including Australia on behalf of the Australian Institute of Management. It would appear, however, that when compared with the current stage of the development of IFC in the United Kingdom the development in Australia has remained at a fairly rudimentary level, with comparisons being largely based upon financial data alone rather than a combination of these and physical quantities.

In recent years the Centre has become increasingly involved in new fields of activity, of which the most important has been that of helping to introduce management ratios within companies and other organisations as an aid to internal planning and control. The Centre has also carried out a continuing programme of research and development in the sphere of performance assessment and comparison.

Apart from its work in manufacturing industries, the Centre has also undertaken IFC projects on behalf of a wide range of particular services and professions including : adoption services, book publishing and distribution, bulk liquid haulage contractors, computing bureaux, express carriers, finance houses, food distribution, housing associations, libraries (public and academic), local authority services, residential houses for the elderly, solicitors and veterinary practices. Interfirm comparison helps firms and services to improve their efficiency and, where appropriate, their profitability by :

1) providing yardsticks for the systematic comparison of their performance in every important aspect of their activity, with that of similar organisations; and
2) indicating the most fruitful lines of action to be taken to improve performance.

Such comparisons are of particular value to top management; they provide an overall review of performance, backed by information about every significant area of the organisation, revealing hidden weaknesses that require remedying, and strengths upon which to build further development. Participating organisations pool their key data, in confidence, in a central body, and receive in return sets of management ratios and other data which show, anonymously and in detail, the full comparative results of every participating organisation. These figures are available only to participants and to no one else. Together with

these results participants also receive a written analytical report on the comparison which explains systematically how the data should be used.

The CIFC does not regard interfirm comparison as a form of management consultancy, but as an aid to self-help. Furthermore, IFC's are not one-off exercises, but are carried out on a regular basis, usually annually. Regular participation gives organisations up-to-date measures of performance in changing conditions, indicates how the trend of their performance compares, and shows them what effect improvements they have introduced are having on their comparative position.

INTER-LIBRARY COMPARISON

Inter-library comparison has been defined as :

> "... the voluntary exchange among members of a group of libraries of quantitative information about their workloads and costs as regards operations common to all or most members of the group, such information being more detailed and analytical than data supplied regularly to the national or other agencies responsible for collecting statistics from libraries of similar type." (Jones, 1982)

Thus, in common with comparison among other kinds of services, the objective of inter-library comparison is to aid library management through the organised pooling of comparative information. This information provides external criteria which a librarian can use as a management tool to help him evaluate the activities of his own library.

These criteria may demonstrate to library management how they compare in the operation of various important activities, or where and why there are differences, and hence what scope there may be for improving services or controlling costs, and what are the most fruitful lines along which action may be taken.

The project undertaken for the British Library commenced in 1977 with a feasibility study involving a small sample of public, academic and special libraries (Centre for Interfirm Comparison, 1977), and was followed by a design study and trial comparison with a group of ten public library systems, (Centre for Interfirm Comparison, 1979). In 1979/80 a larger scale pilot comparison was conducted in which thirty public library systems cooperated, (Centre for Interfirm Comparison, 1981). With the completion of the academic libraries component of the study, described in the present report, the Centre undertook a follow-up investigation of the public library sector.*

The formal aims of the 1981/82 academic library study were :

"1) to discuss with academic librarians and others interested the possible approaches to inter-library comparisons for academic libraries and to design the specific scope and content of comparisons between university libraries and polytechnic libraries;

---

* This latest study, commenced in October 1982, was completed at the end of March 1983 and involved thirty of the forty-seven English and Welsh county public library systems, together with six district library systems in Northern Ireland and six London public libraries. The study was intended to test a simplified approach to ILC in the county library sector. In the United States a proposal has been drafted and funds are being sought to enable the CIFC to undertake a comparison of Ohio metropolitan libraries, through the aegis of the Kent State University.

2) to prepare the data collection for comparison including a reporting form together with associated notes and definitions to assist librarians in contributing properly comparable information;
3) to undertake a test comparison;
4) to report on the work to the participating libraries and, secondly, to the British Library Research and Development Department."
(Centre for Interfirm Comparison, 1982 : 2-3)

With the cooperation of the British Library Research and Development Department (BLRDD), the Standing Conference of National and University Libraries (SCONUL) and the Council of Polytechnic Libraries (COPOL), the CIFC contacted the librarians of a cross-section of academic institutions, comprising seven universities and five polytechnics, who were willing to co-operate in the development of comparisons. These institutions were :

University of Aston in Birmingham
British Library of Political and Economic Science
Glasgow University
University of Kent at Canterbury
University of Leicester
University of St Andrews
University of Sheffield
Bristol Polytechnic
Liverpool Polytechnic
Newcastle-Upon-Tyne Polytechnic
Polytechnic of Central London
Polytechnic of North London

To permit the testing of the methodology a separate group, which was to be included in the test comparison without prior participation in the discussions and development of the work, was recruited. This comprised the libraries of the following :

Edinburgh University
University of Exeter
Imperial College of Science and Technology, London
University of Nottingham
Saint David's University College
Huddersfield Polytechnic
Coventry Polytechnic
Sheffield Polytechnic

The chronology of the project was as follows :

November 1980 : The British library commissioned the CIFC to undertake the academic libraries ILC project.

Spring 1981 : CIFC staff visited participating libraries in order to explain the purpose of the study and gain an understanding of the work undertaken in these libraries.

1st May 1981 :	The British Library Consultative Committee on Inter-library Comparisons for Academic Libraries* met to consider discussion draft 'Possible ratios for academic library comparisons'.
May 1981 :	Further visits were made by CIFC staff to a number of participating libraries to help finalize the ratios to be employed and to agree broad definitions of items to be included in the study.
12th June 1981 :	A second meeting of the consultative Committee was held to consider the second draft of the ratios and the proposed definitions.
June 1981 :	The agreed set of ratios was circulated to participants.
27th August 1981 :	Briefing session for those staff of participating libraries responsible for the completion of the reporting forms was held. (The reporting periods were FY1979/80 for the Universities and London polytechnics and FY1980/81 for the other polytechnics.)
9th October 1981 :	This was the target date set for the return of the questionnaires.
November 1981 :	The majority of the forms were actually returned this month.
December 1981 - January 1982 :	The remaining forms were returned. (The impact of the Government's higher education funding cuts on participating libraries resulted in the late return of the majority of the forms.)
Early March 1982 :	Report** issued to participants.

Upon the completion of the study it was concluded by the British Library Consultative Committee on Inter-library Comparisons for Academic Libraries that the methodology which had been devised and tested provided a satisfactory basis for future comparisons. It was considered that comparisons should be run on an annual basis and that more libraries should be permitted to participate. Certain participants, particularly the university librarians felt that the heterogeneity of the sample gave

---

* The Committee comprised representatives from SCONUL, COPOL, Library Association and the Office of Arts and Libraries of the Department of Education and Science.

** See sample pages at Appendix I.

them an inadequate basis for comparison. The sample chosen, however, had been intentionally broad in order to permit the testing of the technique in a wide variety of academic libraries. Participants were urged to take steps to ensure the early availability of data for future comparisons, although it was acknowledged that the content of the test comparison could be simplified without undue loss of essential matter.

Data was provided most readily by the single site polytechnics, and with most difficulty by universities with decentralised sites and management structures. The smallest participating library (which has only ten staff) also experienced difficulty, due primarily to the problem of apportioning functions and services among such a small number of people in view of the CIFC's insistence that only staff employed full-time on any particular activity should be counted. It was expected that this library might not obtain the same value from the comparison as would the larger libraries.

It was considered desirable that future comparisons should be conducted nationally with the endorsement of the appropriate bodies (i.e. the British Library, COPOL and SCONUL). National support might also lead to a more reliable basis for funding as the British Library Research and Development Department would be unable to finance an on-going programme, and it seemed unlikely that participants could meet the full costs themselves. Funding aspects are discussed later.

The comparison provides information on a library's resources and on the way in which they are employed in order both to carry out the technical functions necessary for it to operate and to provide services to its users. This approach is illustrated* below :

	EXPENDITURE ON RESOURCES	EMPLOYMENT OF RESOURCES	
Type of Resources	Books & Other Materials	FUNCTIONS	SERVICES
	Library Staff	Staff Costs of Function(s)	Staff Costs of Services(s)
	Other Operating Resources (e.g. computer, photocopy, inter-library loans, etc.	Other Operating cost of Function(s)	Other Operating cost of Service(s)
	TOTAL	Total costs of Function(s)	Total costs of Service(s)
		Functional Outputs	Service Outputs

* Reproduced, with permission, from *Inter-library comparisons : development, study and test comparison for academic libraries. Report: folder L* CIFC, 1982.

The information provided fell into the following categories :

1. Cost structure ratios - to indicate resource allocation by type of expenditure.

2. Functional expenditure ratios - to show the priority given to expenditure on the various functions and services of the library.

3. Cost/output ratios - to relate resources used to work done for the various functions and services of the library.

4. Background information - to assist in interpreting the ratios described above. This information is concerned with the characteristics of the libraries, the methods employed by them and the services they provide.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE UNIVERSITY AND POLYTECHNIC ILD PROJECT

My purpose in visiting participating libraries was not to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the project but to ensure that the various points of view and attitudes were recorded and, in particular, to note those factors which might be especially relevant in the context of Australian academic libraries.

Quite predictably, reactions to the project were varied; some participants were almost unreservedly enthusiastic, others had doubts about certain aspects of the study, while a few were generally sceptical about the value of the findings, at least as far as their own libraries were concerned. Consequently, some librarians were already planning for their involvement in a second round, even before the report of the first has been distributed. In contrast, a small minority had such reservations that they felt deterred from committing their libraries to future participation. Generally there appeared to be a more positive reaction from COPOL members than from those of SCONUL; the former organisation planned to hold two seminars for the purpose of training middle-range management staff in the application of the ILC technique.

On the basic question of the scope of the study there were, at the outset, some who held the opinion that there was little point in comparing universities and polytechnics because they had so little in common, or so it was claimed. The results, however, tend to belie this and reveal more similarities than differences. The problem of multi-site operations, which had been regarded as one specific to many of the polytechnics, was found to be no more pronounced in these institutions than in the universities represented in the study. This particular similarity possibly arose, however, because most of the universities participating were the older institutions and not the more recent foundations with their centralised library services (e.g., the Universities of East Anglia, Loughborough and Sussex). It was with these newer purpose-built university libraries that the polytechnic libraries had tended to compare themselves.

There were a few functional areas in which obvious differences arose. Some of these appeared to reflect the university libraries' custodial role; they tended to be more committed to binding than were the polytechnics, and a number of universities were evidently heavily involved in catalogue conversion. It was speculated that this latter probably arose as a result of the appearance of AACR2 and DC19 rather than as a consequence of the retrospective cataloguing of older stock for a computer-based catalogue. On the other hand, the liaison function appeared to be much more pronounced in the polytechnic libraries. These are just a few of the more obvious features which tended to distinguish the two types of library and no doubt a systematic comparison of the tables, ratio by ratio, would reveal many more. It was conceded, however, that many of the dissimilarities between university

and polytechnic libraries would not necessarily be apparent from an ILC investigation of this kind, which did not take qualitative factors into consideration.

Just as overall attitudes to the study varied, so did views on the purposes to which the data could, or should be put. Opinions appeared to represent two quite distinct philosophies on the use of quantitative information in library management. One was based on the conviction that it was important to have current data on other libraries with which to compare the resources and performance of one's own at that moment of time, regardless of how everyone had fared over a given period. The other view was that it was essential to have adequate internal information which would permit monitoring of performance over time rather than across institutions. As one university librarian put it, "the majority of university librarians are pre-occupied with comparisons - many seem to be nervously looking over each other's shoulders all the time". This informant considered that the main advantage of ILC was that it enabled librarians to monitor their own performance. Most participants did not subscribe to either of these extreme views and believed that it was necessary to have data with which to compare both inter-temporally and cross-sectionally. It is relevant to add, however, that it was apparent to those responsible for conducting the study that many of the participating libraries previously had no structured approach to internal data collection, and so they saw benefits in ILC. Furthermore, some of the librarians of the non-London polytechnics had little idea of the true cost of operating the service for which they were responsible.* The above observations raise, of course, the questions of the frequency of future studies, their depth of detail and the nature of the sample. These matters will be discussed below.

For the CIFC's part, the Senior Project Manager saw particular benefits arising from ILC because it forced librarians to think in terms of inputs and outputs. He urged that it should not be regarded solely as a means of increasing the library budget.

The completion of one or two specific sections of the questionnaire caused fairly widespread difficulties, while others created problems only for specific respondents, largely because of local peculiarities. Specialist institutes, such as the London School of Economics and the Imperial College for Science and Techhnology, did not fit well into the normal university library mould and so experienced particular problems. For example, in the case of the library of the former body, some of the ratios were distorted by the very high proportion of government publications and other material received on automatic deposit. These kinds of problems were foreseen at the planning stage but, as already mentioned, it was considered important to test the technique in some academic libraries generally regarded as atypical.

---

* This comment applies particularly to staff costs, but is not relevant to the London polytechnic librarians, who received a block allocation intended to cover both salary and non-salary costs.

Problems also tended to arise if a library bindery undertook a large amount of laminating, repair work, or non-book binding. This inflated binding costs, without the reason being apparent from the published figures. Other contributors stated that excessive detail was requested in certain parts of the questionnaire and mentioned the inter-library loan section. This required information on postage and transport costs, which apparently caused some difficulties.* The problem of counting staff whose time was divided between different functions was also mentioned, as was the presence of a "management" component in the routines of some subordinate staff; staff in charge of branches for example. The questionnaire did not accommodate management-level functions which were being performed by staff who were otherwise considered as non-managerial.

At the design stage of the questionnaire the Consultative committee foresaw the possibility of encountering difficulties in obtaining institutional finance officers' permission to release data on grounds of confidentiality. As it turned out this problem was more imaginary than real. A more serious difficulty, however arose because of the time lag between the date of the information and the date of the survey. In the case of the university libraries there was a gap of over a year, which caused problems where salaries information was concerned because of the difficulty of identifying those who were in post on the specified date, and on what salary level. The need for adequate notice of information requirements was stressed. Some participants appeared overly concerned that the information produced by the study was out-of-date, but it should be borne in mind that the principal objective was to test the methodology in a particular type of library, rather than yield data which was necessarily current.

On the general matter of problems arising during the course of the study, it should be recalled that the approach adopted for the academic ILC deliberately excluded from the project's planning phase eight of the twenty institutions constituting the final sample. The remaining twelve were, from the outset, given an opportunity of influencing the design of the questionnaire. It seems likely that some of the difficulties mentioned above may have been experienced more widely within the group not involved in the preliminary work.

Some of the problems encountered could be alleviated by more frequent recourse to footnotes when completing the questionnaire, but of course

---

* Some libraries had to pay their own postage costs while in other cases these costs were borne centrally by the institution. When local cooperative inter-library loan van services were established, some libraries in the latter category refused to join for the apparently pragmatic, but short-sighted reason that they were not required to pay for postage, but would need to budget for the cooperative services.

the greater the amount of supplementary detail provided the easier it would be to identify individual libraries.*

Concerning the future of the academic libraries ILC project, there is without a doubt a substantial majority interest in continuing the study on a regular basis. There remains the question of how frequently the survey should be conducted and on what basis the sample should be chosen. From many points of view it would be highly desirable to retain the same libraries for successive surveys. Some contributors, however, saw a need to conduct the study only once every five years, and felt that they could only cooperate on this basis. Others supported the principle of an annual survey, although the possibility of continuing the study regularly, but on two levels, was mentioned. This would involve conducting a full-scale survey only once every five years, while a less detailed investigation could be undertaken annually. An alternative, favoured by the CIFC, was to run a simplified annual survey, but each year to concentrate on a different functional aspect. This had been the case for the pilot academic libraries study, in which inter-library loans had been selected for special emphasis.

The most pressing problem, however, remained that of finding the means of financing future studies. As mentioned above the British Library had funded the initial comparison, but future studies would need to be self-supporting on the basis of contributions of £500 per participant. Some libraries considered this to be expensive, bearing in mind their internal costs associated with the study, which had involved about 40 man hours of staff time. The concomitant cost varied, of course, from library to library according to the level of staff assigned to this task.

Most libraries are large enough to be expected to have sufficient spare staff time to cope with this kind of operation. At least, this was generally the case in 1980 when the idea of the academic libraries project was conceived. Undoubtedly it was less true at the time the survey eventually took place in the Autumn of 1981. Nevertheless, a number of the participants was able to extract from their routinely-collected internal statistics much of the data required for the ILC project.

The CIFC held the view that the most economical way of conducting future investigations was for the Centre to be retained as the project's manager and consultant, but for one institution with the necessary computing facilities to collect the data and undertake its analysis. This would then enable the Centre to reduce its £500 participation charge.

---

* Interestingly, at a post-survey meeting at which participants discussed the results, those present attempted to identify the libraries of their colleagues from the various anonymous published ratios, but no participant was able to do so successfully in every case.

As already mentioned, there has been a demand for more widespread involvement of public libraries in the ILC project. Judging from my discussions with university and polytechnic librarians the future of academic ILC was equally assured. One participant made the valid comment that even if at the present time ILC had proved difficult to apply in the context of certain libraries, the advent of networking and cooperative systems would force libraries to standardize their structures and routines to some extent, and so provide a more uniform basis for comparison.

The technique of ILC appears to be a most significant development in the area of quantitative approaches to library management, but it was evident from discussions that much theoretical work is needed in order to identity the significant variables and obtain a better understanding of their behaviour.

REFERENCES

1. Brockman, J.R. (1982) 'Australian college library management, the AARL statistics and inter-library comparison', *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* 13(3), 162-168.

2. Centre for Interform Comparison. (1979) *Inter-library comparisons : design study and field trials relating to public libraries*, (British Library Research and Development Report 5489).

3. Centre for Interfirm Comparison. (1981) *Inter-library comparisons with public libraries*, (British Library Research and Development Report 5638).

4. Centre for Interfirm Comparison. (1982) *Inter-library comparisons : development study and test comparison for academic libraries.*

5. Centre for Interfirm Comparison. (1977) *Inter-library comparisons : report to the British Library on a feasibility study by the Centre for Interfirm Comparison*, (British Library Research and Development Report 5608).

6. Jones, Graham. (1982) 'Comparing academic libraries', *Library Review* 31, Winter, 239-246.

7. Sizer, John. (1979) 'Developing performance indicators for institutions of higher education', *Coombe Lodge Report*, 11(11), 404-41[illegible].

8. Sorenson, James R and Grove, Hugh D. (1977) 'Cost-outcome and cost-effectiveness analysis : emerging non-profit performance evaluation techniques', *Accounting Review* 52(3), 658-675.

9. Weinberg, Ira. (1977) *Cost indices of private liberal arts colleges*, Centre for Business and Economics Lakeland, Wisconsin, (ERIC Document ED 139335).

APPENDIX

Sample pages reproduced, with permission, from *Inter-library comparisons : development study and test comparisons for academic libraries : report to participants, appendix II, university library results.* CIFC, 1982.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 8 - FUNCTIONAL COST ANALYSIS - LOANS AND RESERVATIONS

Ratio	Library	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	High	Median	Low
10. LOANS & RESERVATIONS (COSTS AS % OF TOTAL LIBRARY COSTS)																
Main Desk																
1) Professional Librarians	%	1.92	0.63	5.02	3.38	1.29	3.22	2.37	2.10	3.66	1.48+	2.0+	3.37+	5.02	2.37	0.63
2) Library Assistants	%	1.86	2.81	6.19	3.70	4.67	9.82	2.98	2.71	4.69	5.54+	7.6+	3.90	9.82	3.70	1.86
3) Other Library staff	%	0.35	-	0.73	0.01	-	-	-	0.92	0.11	-	-	-	0.92	-	-
4) Computer Charges	%	-	-	0.05	0.47	-	-	2.40	0.60	-	-	-	-	2.40	-	-
5) Other Costs	%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.36	-	0.7+	-	0.36	-	-
6) Sub Total (equals ratio 1.b.7)	%	4.13	3.44	11.99	7.56	5.96	13.04	7.69	6.33	8.82	7.02+	10.4+	7.27+	13.04	7.56	3.44
Short Loans Desk																
7) Professional librarians	%	1.12	0.63	1.00	0.69	0.96	-	-	0.07	0.46	+	+	+	1.12	0.63	-
8) Library Assistants	%	2.40	1.28	0.34	1.37	3.73	-	0.96	2.03	1.34	+	+	+	3.73	1.34	-
9) Other Library Staff	%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.13	0.16	-	-	-	1.13	-	-
10) Computer Charges	%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.08	-	-	-	0.08	-	-
11) Other Charges	%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
12) Sub total (equals ratio 1.b.8)	%	3.52	1.91	1.34	2.06	4.69	-	0.96	3.23	2.04	+	+	+	4.69	2.04	-
13) Total	%	7.65	5.35	13.33	9.62	10.65	13.04	8.65	9.58	10.86	7.02	10.4	7.27	13.33	9.60	5.35
Background Information :																
14) Cost per main desk loan transaction	£	0.23	0.28	0.62	0.31	0.35	1.33	0.36	0.17	0.68	0.23)	0.3)	0.22)	1.33	0.35	0.17
15) Cost per short loan desk loan transaction	£	0.16	0.69	0.14	0.22	0.16	-	0.12	0.16	0.28	)	)	)	0.69	0.16	-
16) Loans per head of permanent population	No.	52	17	38	47	82	20	40	82	35	29	24	60	82	39	17
17) Cost per head of user population	£	3.62	4.17	15.69	9.01	10.61	7.34	9.65	11.73	16.78	6.52	7.67	13.15	16.78	9.23	3.62
18) Short loans per head of student population	No.	36	5	16	15	59	-	12	32	15	20	1	13	59	15	-
19) Cost of short loans per head of student population	£	5.81	2.59	2.14	3.26	9.70	-	1.52	5.07	4.12	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.70	3.26	-
20) Reservations per 100 of permanent population	No.	60	N/A	231	215	194	90	72	117	111	151	34	N/A	231	114	34
21) Reservations as % of main loans	%	3	N/A	10	6	6	4	2	2	5	13	2	N/A	13	5	2
22) Loan period for short loan collection		4 hrs	4hrs & o/night	1day or o/night	4days o/night	2days max.	-	4days 12hrs w/end	3hrs & o/night	3hrs	4hrs o/night w/end	3hrs 3days 1 week	3days max.			
23) Loans per volume of short collection	No.	N/A	3	8	19	11	-	30	9	11	8	2	3	30	8	-

Copyright © The Centre for Interfirm Comparison 1982

+ combined figure

TABLE 4 - FUNCTIONAL COST ANALYSIS - ACQUISITIONS & CATALOGING

Ratio	Library	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	High	Median	Low
4. COST OF MONOGRAPH ACQUISITION (£ PER VOLUME ACQUIRED)																
1) Professional Librarians	£	2.37	1.68	1.96	0.51	0.38	4.06	0.61	0.58	1.61	0.76	1.10	0.83	4.06	0.97	0.38
2) Library Assistants	£	1.23	1.21	0.36	0.63	0.62	1.63	0.69	0.59	0.68	0.55	-	0.32	1.63	0.63	-
3) Other Library Staff	£	0.17	0.47	0.87	0.19	-	0.14	0.13	0.10	0.26	-	0.21	-	0.87	0.16	-
4) Total Staff	£	3.77	3.16	3.19	1.33	1.00	5.23	1.39	1.27	2.55	1.29	1.31	1.15	6.23	1.36	1.00
5) Computer Charges	£	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	-	-	-	0.04	-	-
6) Other Costs	£	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	£	3.77	3.16	3.19	1.33	1.00	5.23	1.39	1.27	2.59	1.29	1.31≠	1.15	6.23	1.36	1.00
Background Information :																
8) Volumes acquired per professional librarian	Nos.	4031	6338	3867	18092	29832	2588	15339	14844	6335	12653	8500≠	11396	29832	9948	2588
9) Volumes acquired per acquisition librarian	Nos.	1839	2113	2654	3829	4469	1462	4183	4241	2936	4324	8500≠	5698	8500	4006	1462
10) Expenditure on material per head of "permanent" population	£	16.10	18.16	19.19	17.96	30.25	23.14	27.93	33.51	33.80	19.35	11.70	56.43	56.43	21.25	11.70
11) Expenditure on films/sound recordings/other non-book materials as % of total materials		N/A	1.6	0.4	N/A	3.8	2.2	1.7	2.0	1.2	3.7	N/A	0.9	3.8	1.6	0.2
5. COST OF CATALOGUING (£ PER TITLE CATALOGUED)																
1) Professional Librarians	£	8.08	5.74	4.83	2.50	2.38	4.70	2.33	4.06	5.70	2.65	1.16	2.12	8.08	3.36	1.16
2) Library Assistants	£	1.25	1.92	0.15	0.61	1.95	5.17	0.70	0.71	0.92	1.25	0.43	0.22	5.17	0.82	0.15
3) Other Library Staff	£	0.49	0.88	0.68	0.84	-	2.00	0.11	0.70	0.55	0.52	0.22	0.54	2.00	0.55	-
4) Total Staff	£	9.82	8.54	5.66	3.95	4.33	11.87	3.14	5.47	7.17	4.42	1.81	2.88	11.87	4.95	1.81
5) Cataloguing Charges																
a - computer	£	-	0.49	1.27+	0.79	-	-	0.73+	-	0.35	1.38+	1.50+	-	0.79	-	-
b - manual	£	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6) Catalogue production charges																
a - computer	£	-	0.07	+	+	-	-	+	-	0.46	+	+	-	0.46	-	-
b - manual	£	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	-	0.01	-	-
7) Other costs	£	-	0.04	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.37	-	0.37	-	-
Total	£	9.82	9.14	6.93	4.74	4.33	11.87	3.87	5.47	7.98	5.80	3.69	2.88	11.87	5.64	2.88

Copyright © The Centre for Interfirm Comparison 1982

+ combined figure
≠ estimated figure

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WAIT Library Publications

Available from the Administrative Officer, T.L. Robertson Library Western Australian Institute of Technology, Kent Street, Bentley, WA 6102

(All prices in Australian dollars and plus postage)

Spoor, E.A. (1984), Automated systems at four Ontario universities : a study leave report	$ 5.00
Allen, G.G., and Exon, F.C.A. (1983), Interim report on a study of the users of academic and research libraries in Western Australia	$ 3.50
Henderson, J. (1982), T.L. Robertson Library sign manual	$ 8.50
Hults, J. and Chaterjee, S.R. (1981), Management in Asia : a bibliography	$ 1.70
Joint serials catalogue of Western Australian academic libraries (1984)	$ 70.00
Library annual report	gratis
16mm films held at Murdoch University, the University of Western Australia and the Western Australian Institute of Technology	$ 6.00
WAIT Library monograph catalogue on microfiche 4 complete editions a year and a cumulating weekly supplement for separate Author, Title and Subject sequences. Available on a subscription basis or as individual parts.	price on application

Library Training Videotapes

1. Monograph acquisitions for the WAIT Library A folder of explanatory material is being prepared for distribution into the videotape	$300.00

Western Library Studies

1. Brockman, J.R. and Klobas, J. (1983), Libraries and books in distance education	$19.00
2. Kelman, B.A. and Klobas, J. (1983), Computerised indexing of Australian newspapers : a pilot study using AUSINET's facilities	$10.00

Forthcoming issues

3. Gilbert, A.M. and Immonen, H.A. Collection overlap implications for sharing monograph cataloguing among Western Australian libraries